# CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

May 15, 2014

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review

in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Kevin Sutton

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Scott Waggoner, Mike Nichols

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steven Fischer, Manager; Gary Lee, Senior Planner;

Dennis Lisk, Associate Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp with Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:02 p.m.

#### **MINUTES**

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 27, 2014 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (3-0) WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

#### **PROJECT REVIEW**

# LAND-2013-01305, 170<sup>th</sup> Place Townhomes

**Description:** Demolition of an existing single family home and the construction of seven (7) attached

townhomes, in two building groups, on a 13,300 square foot lot. **Location:** Corner of 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 82<sup>nd</sup> Street **Applicant:** Dan Umbach *with* Daniel Umbach, Architect, LLC

Prior Review Dates: 11/21/13, 01/16/14 & 03/27/14

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee noted that this application was approved by the DRB on March 27. Since that time, however, the applicant has been reviewing the Building Code requirements, which has led to the applicant's decision to change the roof style of the project. Staff is recommending approval but wants the review of the DRB on that recommendation, as the change to the roof is significant.

Dan Umbach presented on behalf of the applicant and said that his design team, previously, had taken an overly optimistic perspective on story heights for this building. The result is that the top floor will have to be more of an attic than a full story. The roof has now been tipped to the north to bring it down to a level with the front of the building. The rooms on the back side of the building are still on the top floor, and these rooms open up to a roof deck. The same change happens on the back two buildings, though these are not as visible.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

### Mr. Sutton:

Said he preferred the old version of the building, but he did not know how to change the new version given the constraints of the Building Code. The applicant said he could have done a stepped roof that would go from unit to unit, but that would make for a fussy design. He wanted to have a simple roof form. The new roof design brings the scale of the building down on the street side.

Mr. Sutton said he was okay with the new design and noted that, from the ground level, the roof was not all that visible.

### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked if it was an issue that the roof was sloping in two directions. Mr. Krueger said the design seemed odd and complicated to him. The applicant said the design was not all that difficult.
- Mr. Krueger asked if one step could be added into the roof so that it would not slope in two directions. The applicant said the design might be unusual, but he has worked on similar roof styles before.

### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he liked the new design. Mr. Palmquist said having one plane for the roof would make the most sense. He said that the roof was small enough that having one plane would work well.
- Mr. Palmquist said the new roof, overall, would be an improvement.
- Mr. Meade asked for a motion for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE PROJECT LAND-2013-01305, 170<sup>TH</sup> PLACE TOWNHOMES, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

#### **PROJECT REVIEW**

## LAND-2014-00477, Redmond District Court

**Description:** Addition of a 450 square foot vestibule to front entrance. Vestibule is to contain security

screening operations of the building. **Location:** 8601 – 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE **Applicant:** Erica Loynd with DLR Group

Prior Review Date: 04/17/14

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer, 425-556-2432 or sfischer@redmond.gov

Mr. Fischer noted that this is the second time this application has come before the DRB. It is a vestibule for the District Court just across the campus from Redmond City Hall. The applicant is proposing a 450 square foot addition to the front entrance of the court building for security issues. There are no proposed changes to the landscape. Colors and materials will be modified to offset the existing building. Color selection will be limited to the available stock of the manufacturer of the metal panels proposed. The metal panels are expected to be a smooth surface with an offset color. Signage will be changing on the site, and a review of this change with the City's Sign Code staff indicates that the proposed signs are too large. The building is allowed signs on each façade, meaning the front and two sides of the building. Mr. Fischer said the applicant needed to address this point. Staff would also like to see a top on the building, and would like DRB's thoughts on this issue as well. The façade that faces out to the west is still a concern for staff. In the last design, this façade included a large sign panel. Now, there is a blank wall with an offset window. Staff is concerned this might not meet the blank wall standard.

Erica Loynd presented on behalf of the applicant. She said she had tried to implement as many comments as possible from the DRB at the previous meeting on this project. However, there are a number of constraints as regards touching the existing building. The applicant said nothing has changed significantly from the last version of the design. There is an entry from the north and an exit only route from the south due to the traffic flow for security measures. The signs have been pulled off of the building to make more of a statement as people enter the building from the north parking lot. The sign is more of an artistic piece that draws people from the parking lot. Signs have also been added to give direction to people coming from City Hall. The applicant noted that Carl McArthy, the City's Sign Code Compliance Officer, told her that he was concerned about having signs on the building on each façade. However, due to where the canopies of the building are located, it would be difficult to put the signs in spots that are visible from each direction. Mr. McArthy said he would be in touch with staff about this issue.

The façade from the west elevation is more of a blank slate in the new design. The joint patterning has been aligned with the fenestration, as the DRB discussed at the last meeting on this project. The window openings have been simplified, which is another item the DRB requested. The applicant showed two colors available from top metal panel manufacturers that would match the building. Using an accenting color

would be slightly more difficult, based on availability. The DRB had asked the applicant to look into the idea of making the elevation not match the existing parapets, but due to structural concerns of tying into the building, the applicant has not made that change. She said there are a lot of limitations on this project, and she thanked the DRB for their understanding on that issue.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

#### Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the blank wall rule on this project. Mr. Fischer noted that the Code said that if the wall width is not broken up by a window or door, and greater than 15 feet, and if the height is between four feet and 13 feet above the ground, such a structure would be in a blank wall situation. Also, if the uninterrupted area is greater than 400 square feet, it would be considered a blank wall.
- The applicant said the wall in question was 13 feet long. Mr. Meade said the section 13 feet, one and one-half inch. Thus, this would not cross the 15-foot threshold of being a blank wall.

#### Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the free-standing sign and how that related to the canopy. The applicant said the canopy protrudes five feet. The signage would be pulled away so that the sidewalk can go around the front.
   The dimension of the sign is between five and six feet.
- Overall, Mr. Sutton said he was happy with the look of the building, but he was concerned about the edge of the canopy and its relation to the signage.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the color of the panels that would be the leading choice for the applicant. The applicant said a color in the white or beige range would be the top choice. Any other choices would make the existing building look dirty, in the applicant's opinion.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the finish on the signs. The applicant said the signs would play off the mullion color on the building, which would be an anodized aluminum with a dark, coppery tone.
- Mr. Sutton said he was okay with those choices, and reiterated his concern about the relation of the sign and the canopy to make both elements more distinct. The applicant accepted this criticism.

### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the north entry and if there might be a way of wrapping one of the signs around the north corner to make this building more part of the City of Redmond campus. Such a sign would not run into as many Sign Code issues, Mr. Krueger said, as has been demonstrated on other applications the DRB has reviewed.
- Mr. Krueger asked if there was a way to address staff's comments about providing a top to this building. The applicant said a more detailed coping could be added to answer that concern.
- Mr. Fischer suggested that the sign comments should be reserved for Mr. McArthy, if the signs are free-standing. If the sign is attached to the building, then the sign location is part of the architecture and more part of the DRB's purview. The DRB could ask Mr. McArthy to assist the applicant in this regard.

### Mr. Meade:

- Said the coping suggested by the applicant would be a good idea. Mr. Meade said the panel color should be one of the whiter shades. He said the sign Mr. Sutton was concerned about should have a connection to the window size, and could be attached to the building. Such a sign, Mr. Meade suggested, could come down to the lower mullion.
- Mr. Meade said overall, the building was fine and reflected what the DRB was concerned about at the last meeting on this project.

#### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he liked the design, sign issues aside. Mr. Palmquist said he understood the restrictions of the panel color. He was comfortable with approving this project.
- Mr. Meade asked, if the sign became a building-mounted sign, and part of the architecture, what it might be in terms of size or design. Mr. Fischer said this could be an issue for Mr. McArthy to review. Mr. Meade hoped to give the applicant some direction before that review process.

- Mr. Meade said he liked the approach of making the sign more of an art piece, but he could see the City wanting the way-finding function of this sign to make more sense. He said leaving the sign issue up to Mr. McArthy would make more sense.
- Mr. Krueger asked about colors. Mr. Meade said approving two colors would be one way to proceed, and if the applicant varies from that, the project could come back to the DRB. Mr. Fischer said that was doable. Mr. Meade said the white and copper colors were his top two choices. Mr. Sutton said the white color was his top choice.
- The applicant said that white color was a standard color that was available all the time. Mr. Krueger said he had a hard time approving a color in relation to the background of the existing building. Mr. Meade said the white would be much lighter than the existing building, and would provide a contemporary look to the project. Mr. Krueger said he was on board with the white color.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE PROJECT LAND-2014-00477, REDMOND DISTRICT COURT, WITH THE PLANS PRESENTED TO THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AT THIS MEETING, SUBJECT TO WORKING WITH CITY STAFF AS REGARDS SIGNAGE. THE COLOR WHITE WOULD BE USED FOR THE PANELING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### LAND-2014-00839, Esterra Park Buildings 2A & 2B

Description: Construction of two new office buildings, underground parking garages, and urban hill

climb pathway

Location: North central portion of Esterra Park Master Plan site

Architect: Patrick Gordon *with* ZGF Architects **Applicant**: Mike Hubbard *with* Capstone Partners

Staff Contact: Dennis Lisk, 425-556-2471 or <a href="mailto:dwlisk@redmond.gov">dwlisk@redmond.gov</a>

Mr. Lisk said that this was the first pre-application meeting for the two buildings on this site. This is the north central portion of the Esterra Park Master Plan in Overlake Village. Two office buildings have been proposed, both of which are six to seven stories tall. The square footage will be around 225,000 square feet per building with several levels of underground parking. There would be around 1,200-1,300 underground spaces between the two buildings. The buildings cascade down the hill climb pathway, which is a central feature of this project. Both buildings will front on the new park that Capstone, the applicant, is building. At this early stage, there are several major considerations, including the hill climb pathway design and how the buildings relate to the pathway. A terrace space between the buildings has been proposed, as well.

Staff would also like to talk about the accessibility for pedestrians to these buildings. Staff would like to promote having interior pathways inside the buildings to allow pedestrians to more easily navigate the hill. Such a design has been done on projects in Seattle and could be done in this case, as well. The variety of the buildings is another issue, and staff is hoping to work in more variety in terms of how the buildings look. The buildings look similar, but different to Building 3 on this campus, and the emphasis should be to create a family of buildings. However, staff would like to add more diversity to these buildings. Modulation could help. Mr. Lisk noted that in the past, the DRB approved the administrative design flexibility on Building 3 as regards modulation, which could inform the design of this new project. Staff is interested to hear about the building materials, which includes a lot of glazing, which staff likes.

Patrick Gordon with ZGF Architects presented on behalf of the applicant with Kristen Lundquist of Brumbaugh and Associates, the landscape architect on the project. The applicant said this was the next chapter in the Esterra Park development and the second installment of a trilogy of three phases of office buildings. The applicant said some similar design elements will be used that were used on Building 3, but some changes will be introduced, too. The fundamental framework of the site, which connects 152<sup>nd</sup> to 156<sup>th</sup>, will be the hill climb. The gateways on either end of the hill climb will be of particular focus, as well as the park in the middle of the site. The applicant would like the buildings to have a distinct set of roles in relation to those public spaces. The level of quality established with Building 3 would be continued with the new design. The applicant said this project was less about the buildings but more about the experience of the site overall.

Buildings 2A and 2B are different than Building 3, the applicant noted. Building 3 is bounded on two sides by busy streets with vehicles. Getting to 155<sup>th</sup>, there are no cars fronting Buildings 2A and 2B. These buildings are fronted by the hill climb and the parks. The entire south façade of the buildings is a pedestrian zone. The applicant would like the DRB to understand the buildings from the hill climb perspective. Because there are no cars, the drop off areas for these buildings will happen at the corners. The applicant said these buildings are a gateway to the hill climb, which is a very different situation than Building 3. The applicant said the success of Buildings 2A and 2B will depend on how the east and west elevations are activated horizontally and vertically.

There is a 45-foot elevation difference between 155<sup>th</sup> and 152<sup>nd</sup>. The elevation gain happens in several different segments, but the climb is significant. The hope is that the building elevations create some variety along the hill climb. The applicant said if the buildings back away and create more of a public realm, and if the buildings do not extrude out of the ground, then the experience of the climb will be amplified. Creating opportunities along the route of the hill climb for pedestrian engagement will be critical. Having something go on at every level of the building to engage with the hill climb will be difficult, however. The middle levels of the two buildings are connected, and should be a very active space. This location could serve as a cafeteria or some other major public area. This could almost be an extension of the public space outside. The applicant showed the DRB the building overhang, and how the facades would be pulled back to expand the public space. This could also provide more weather protection for pedestrians.

The west entrance to Building 2A, the westerly-most building, is basically the entrance lobby. The next level is just a partial floor plate. The parking does not engage the hill climb. Moving up, the first floor is an office floor. The mid-grade floor is the next one up, and is a contiguous floor that runs the full length along that space. A cafeteria or other major meeting space would be optimal here. Moving up another level, the building has its most easternmost lobby. The entrance to 2B is on that corner. Finally, there are two office floors above this level. The applicant reminded the DRB that there was an active street, along 28<sup>th</sup> for Building 3 and pedestrians are held away from it. But pedestrians are brought to that building through the lobby. Buildings 2A and 2B, in the applicant's opinion, have a different role. The hope is these buildings identify different entrances to the Esterra site, and the applicant said these buildings will be quieted down in their design and embrace the public space. Building 2B will have some good opportunities for incredible views.

The back sides of the building will have the loading docks, fire access, and service drive areas. The loading docks between the two buildings will be combined. Building 2A has two to two and a half of its parking levels exposed. The applicant was not sure how to avoid this condition, but the steepness of the slope dictated the situation. The west façade of Building 2A serves as somewhat of a lantern, and announces an entrance for pedestrians at the corner. The east elevation of Building 2B has a similar engagement with the street frontage.

Ms. Lundquist next spoke on behalf of the applicant. She noted that the center of the village is the park and urban pathway connecting the buildings. A key piece of that is the green, open space area between the two buildings. Residents will seek out the natural area between the two buildings. One of the goals of the open space and hill climb will be to connect the buildings to the park. The applicant wants to bring the public into the space and break down the barriers between public and private areas. Thus, some outdoor "rooms" have been created along the urban pathway. To the east, there is a patio space, another plaza area separated by additional landscape, and a pathway and stairs that lead up to the drop off zone on the corner. Paving patterns will help break down the larger terraced spaces. Smaller scale paving will happen at the building entries.

The landscape character will include some seasonal plantings to create interest in the area year-round. Conifer trees, deciduous trees, and plants with different colors and textures will create a tapestry to enrich the space and make it an intriguing jewel. The landscape will be sustainable, with native, drought-tolerant plantings used.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

#### Mr. Meade:

- Asked if anyone in the audience wanted to comment. Mr. Hans Gundersen spoke to the DRB. He said he had lived in Redmond for 30 years. He participated in the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update a few years ago. He said there was nothing in that plan about clear-cutting the property the DRB is reviewing at this meeting.
- Mr. Gunderson said he was horrified to see the land development was this intense. He said the
  existing trees provided an urban wilderness that really connects the population of workers in this area
  with space that kids can actually play in.
- He said this was an urban, boring park that would be better placed on top of a stormwater basin. He said the land already has what it needs. He said this plan was outrageous and a huge missed opportunity. He suggested that the DRB rethink the development and offer more space, retain more existing trees, and build the building around the natural space rather than through it.
- Mr. Meade thanked Mr. Gunderson and asked if there were others who wished to speak. No one else came forward.

### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about materials and colors, which appear to be similar to Building 3. The applicant said natural
  materials would be used again. There are opportunities to introduce metal, but overall, those
  materials are yet to be determined.
- Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Lisk if this project matched up with the Master Plan for this site. Mr. Lisk said
  the Master Plan did not have specific architectural suggestions. Mr. Krueger clarified that the Master
  Plan spoke more to the creation of an overall neighborhood that was cohesive, but that had some
  building variety.
- Mr. Lisk said the Master Plan included some pictures that could provide some design cues, but there were no specific suggestions for architecture and style. He said the building diversity topic should speak to the idea that this is an organic, urban neighborhood that will develop in phases. The area should not have a campus feel, but rather, an urban sensibility with a variety of buildings.
- Mr. Krueger wanted to make sure the buildings did look different, especially with regard to materials
  and colors. He liked the hill climb and the design surrounding it. Exposed parking will be a concern as
  the DRB further looks into this project, and Mr. Krueger would like to know how the impact of that
  design characteristic would be mitigated.
- Mr. Krueger would like to see creative, distinctive experiences in the buildings. He noted that the Pearl District of Portland provided a good example of building variety.

#### Mr. Meade:

- Said this was a brilliant start to the project, and said that if these buildings were standing alone, without Building 3, it would be really exciting. Mr. Meade said that Building 3 is extraordinary, and he did not want to dilute how extraordinary it was.
- Mr. Meade said that Buildings 2A and 2B should stand on their own. He liked the iconic lantern pieces. He would like the applicant to consider some materials and pattern changes to make these buildings stand out.
- Mr. Meade said the hill climb was resolving itself. He would like to see some details on the outdoor "rooms" mentioned earlier.

#### Mr. Sutton:

- Said he was happy with where the buildings were starting. Mr. Sutton confirmed that there would be a level that connects between the two buildings and goes across the site. The applicant noted that there was shared parking below the buildings, as well, that could be shared.
- Mr. Sutton said the interaction with interior and exterior space would be great at that connected level. He was very interested to see how that would develop. He said the relationship between the hill climb element and the buildings at grade was his main concern. He would like to see the hill climb from some other perspectives to see how the grade issues would be resolved.
- Mr. Sutton asked about the areas where the grade meets the building, and if there were opportunities
  for something special in some of these smaller spaces.

He asked about landscaping on the roof of the buildings and how that would be visible from other
parts of the development. The applicant said that area was a great opportunity and would serve to
attract new residents.

### Mr. Palmquist:

- Said the project was off to a great start. Mr. Palmquist said he would like to see more of the connected floor between the two buildings. He was very interested to see how the hill climb would engage the building, as Mr. Sutton discussed. He would like to see what it was like for pedestrians to walk under the buildings from the hill climb and how they would be attracted there.
- As far as the buildings are concerned, Mr. Palmquist said the entries of Buildings 2A and 2B and Building 3 are somewhat similar. He encouraged the applicant to switch that up a bit so that all the buildings stand out on their own.

#### Mr. Meade:

- Said there were subtle differences the applicant could explore between the buildings. Mr. Meade asked if some vertical elements could be added, such as an archway, in the area where the buildings connect.
- The applicant said all the comments from the DRB seem to be consistent with what he is considering. He noted that he was clear on the DRB's statements that the buildings should be different. The applicant said he was nervous that if too much variety was piled on, a pastiche situation could be created.
- The applicant wants to keep the focus on the experience of the buildings, and he will explore the comments of the DRB at the next meeting.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the light green area north of Building 2A. The applicant said this was a landscape lid over the parking structure. Ms. Lundquist said there would not be a lot of soil depth and plenty of shade. The hope is to provide some interest for people seeing this area from above, but it would not be feasible to plant trees in this area.
- Mr. Meade said the project was off to a great start and he appreciated the applicant's viewpoint that subtle changes to the design would be the key for differentiation between the buildings on the site.
   Color and material changes could go a long way toward that differentiation. The DRB and applicant thanked each other for their time.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

July 17, 2014
MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY

Susan Trapp